arXiv:hep-th/0410293v2 10 Feb 2005

hep-th/0410293

Type IIB string theory, S-duality, and generalized cohomology [*]

Igor Kriz[†1] and Hisham Sati [‡2,3]

[1] *Department of Mathematics*
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109,
USA

[2] *Department of Physics*
University of Adelaide
Adelaide, SA 5005,
Australia

[3] *Department of Pure Mathematics*
University of Adelaide
Adelaide, SA 5005,
Australia

Abstract

In the presence of background Neveu-Schwarz flux, the description of the Ramond-Ramond fields of type IIB string theory using twisted K-theory is not compatible with S-duality. We argue that other possible variants of twisted K-theory would still not resolve this issue. We propose instead a connection of S-duality with elliptic cohomology, and a possible T-duality relation of this to a previous proposal for IIA theory, and higher-dimensional limits. In the process, we obtain some other results which may be interesting on their own. In particular, we prove a conjecture of Witten that the 11-dimensional spin cobordism group vanishes on $K(\mathbb{Z}, 6)$, which eliminates a potential new θ-angle in type IIB string theory.

---

[*] I. K. is supported by NSF grant DMS 0305853, and H. S. is supported by the Australian Research Council.

[†] E-mail: `ikriz@umich.edu`

[‡] E-mail: `hsati@maths.adelaide.edu.au`

1 Introduction

There are two string theories with two supersymmetries in ten dimensions, nonchiral type IIA and chiral type IIB theories. Type IIB supergravity [1] is the classical low energy limit of type IIB string theory. There is no manifestly Lorentz-invariant action for this theory [2], but one can write down the equations of motion [5],[4], and the symmetries and transformation rules [3]. An action which encodes self-duality was proposed in [6]. However, such an action does not seem to be well-adapted for the topologically nontrivial situations we are interested in. Type IIB theory is free of chiral anomalies [7].

Since both are ten-dimensional, why is IIB different than IIA? First note that in both cases, what is self-dual is the total field strength $F = \sum_i F_i$ with $i = 2p$ for IIA and $i = 2p + 1$ for IIB. In the IIA story, F_4 might be viewed as having somewhat of a more transparent role than the other fields because that is the field directly descending from the fundamental field of M-theory, namely G_4. In IIB, there is no obvious way of picking one of the field (because it is not as transparently related to M-theory), but it should have a rank close to four, i.e. either the three-form or the five-form. Dualities give some hints. M-theory on a torus T^2 is equivalent to type IIB on a circle S^1 in the limit when the volume of the torus shrinks to zero (i.e. T-duality) [8] [9]. So if we start with G_4 in M-theory, then we can either reduce diagonally or vertically. The result of the former is a two-form, F_2 which can only be lifted over the circle diagonally to a three-form of type IIB. For the latter, we still have a four-form F_4 which can only lift diagonally to the IIB five-form. So in this way we see that the fields of degrees three and five in IIB are what is taking role which F_4 played in IIA. A detailed account of the relation between IIB and M-theory can be found in [10].

Self-duality is usually a subtle issue to deal with when quantizing (see e.g. [11] [12]), via the path integral in our case. In type IIA, this was taken care of in [13] by summing over a set of commuting periods for the partition function, which amounted to picking a polarization over the torus K^0/K^0_{tors} which keeps only the forms F_0, F_2 and F_4 and kills the "duals". Then one could still further ignore all but F_4. Now the problem with just F_4 makes sense quantum-mechanically, because for one thing, it is not self-dual, and so the partition function is well-defined. In type IIB, a'priori F is not a sum of even number of terms as was the case in IIA, where had the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded expansion

$$F = F_0 + F_2 + F_4 + F_6 + F_8 + F_{10}. \tag{1.1}$$

Now in IIB we have

$$F = F_1 + F_3 + F_5 + F_7 + F_9 \tag{1.2}$$

which contains only five terms. So it is not obvious how to pick a polarization which kills half the terms as was done in IIA. However, one might argue that F_5 can be split into two parts according to self-duality/antiselfduality. One might also argue that since the theory has a (spacetime-filling) $D9$-brane, which couples to a 10-form potential C_{10}, one requires a corresponding field strength F_{11}. But in 10-dimensions this cannot occur. However, the rescue might be in looking at higher dimensions. If we take the view that type IIB theory has an intrinsic 12-dimensional structure associated to it, by viewing the $SL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ S-duality symmetry of the moduli, as actually coming from a physical torus on which the theory had been compactified, then one can identify the two modular groups and one gets a 12-dimensional lift of IIB, namely F-theory [14]. This is motivated by the fact that the S-duality group $SL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ is in fact a U-duality group [15] and the use of the intuition from compactification of M-theory to "discover" this as the modular group of an internal torus. If we take this point of view, then we have a total RR field strength with an even number of terms and thus we can pick a polarization that kills F_{2p+1} for $p \geq 3$.

Next, one has to pick whether to keep F_3 or F_5, and further worry about analyzing the problem in an S-duality-covariant fashion. This is implied in the self-duality of F_5, which as we mentioned above, will have to be treated very carefully in the partition funcion, and the S-duality symmetry of F_3 which amounts to having to consider H_3 at an equal footing, that is look at the pair as an $SL(2,\mathbb{Z})$-doublet, i.e. as transforming in the two-dimensional representation of (subgroup of) the modular group.

Indeed, one of the problems that was discussed in [13] is that there seems to be no symmetry between the Neveu-Schwarz three-form H_3 and the Ramond-Ramond three-form F_3, because traditionally F_3 is viewed as a K-theory object whereas H_3 is an ordinary differential form. They propose two approaches: The first is that there is a source term Q for the anomaly equation, so that [1] $Q = H_3 \cup H_3$. The second is that the $SL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ invariance of the theory does not come from a simple transformation law on the space of classical configurations, i.e. the invariance of the partition function need not come from an invariance on the classical fields but appears only when one looks at equivalence classes (as was done in comparing M-theory to IIA). However, no convincing scenario for the latter was found.

The above can be rephrased in terms of differentials in the Atiyah-Hirzebruch Spectral Sequence (AHSS). In particular, the problem is to find an S-duality covariant extension of the third differential. Some discussions of this issue has appeared in [16]. For the twisted case, without the S-duality issue, the third differential was studied and given a very nice physical interpretation in [17]. From the point of view of branes and solitons, some further discussion on this can be found in [18] [19]. Some progress in the resolution of the S-duality problem was made in [38] from a different point of view, using their model of the M-theory three-form.

Now let us take this one step further. If one takes the view that H_3 is interpreted as a twisting for K-theory ([20] and [21] [22] [23]), then H_3 is more naturally associated to a gerbe than a differential form. A gerbe is in some sense a "higher" object than that of K-theory, i.e. a vector bundle, and so one can argue that in order to provide a description that treats the NS fields and the RR fields on equal footing, one has to go beyond K-theory.

The question then is which (twisted) generalized cohomology theory is the right one to use? In type IIA, the answer [24] was somewhat more manifest since the Diaconescu-Moore-Witten anomaly [13] W_7 was given by $\beta Sq^2(x_4)$, where x_4 is a four-class which could naturally be identified with four-form. In type IIB, however, there is no natural four-class available and so the situation is a little bit subtle.

In this paper, we find that to resolve the S-duality problem in IIB, one cannot use any variant of twisted K-theory where the twisting is merely by an integral cohomology class in dimension 3. Such theory would be classified by a fibered space over the space classifying K^1 whose fiber would be $K(\mathbb{Z},3)$, but we find that there is no such space in which the first Postnikov invariant would be compatible with S-duality. It is important to point out that our analysis does *not* exclude the possibility of a solution which combines the 3-dimensional twisting with some higher twisting. On the other hand, we note that such higher twisting would amount to constructing, term by term, a Postnikov tower of some space which merely maps to K^1. We include some speculation about the nature of that space or generalized cohomology theory.

---

[1] At the level of differential forms, i.e. over $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, this term is a wedge product of two copies of the same odd differential form, and thus vanishes identically. However, over $\mathbb{Z}$, this can be 2-torsion. Note that S-duality and U-duality care about integral information.

More precisely, the authors have a candidate theory which they found in connection with the T-dual scenario of IIA in [24], namely *elliptic cohomology.* What happens is that under certain conditions, there exists an elliptic cohomology analogue of the physical theory which defines the type II partition functions via K-theory [13, 12]. Elliptic cohomology, by design, has built in modularity which seems indeed to correspond with IIB S-duality. It is possible that in a suitable scenario, the sources F_3 and H_3 would both originate in elliptic cohomology which might resolve the puzzle in that range. We do not claim, however, that such scenario occurs in classical weak-coupled IIB string theory. Although IIB theory is U-dual to itself, it is nevertheless possible that on a line in moduli space connecting the two U-duals, dimensional expansion may occur. Dimensional expansion should, in fact, be generic. We think that it is that range to which the elliptic partition function corresponds, and we will pursue this direction in follow-up work.

There is another piece of evidence that the elliptic cohomology partition function should involve dimensional expansion and unification of string theories. The existence of the elliptic theory in the untwisted case requires the condition $w_4(X^{10}) = 0$, which is a stronger condition than the untwisted IIA obstruction $W_7(X^{10}) = 0$ (we will see that in untwisted IIB theory, there is no obstruction at all; that doesn't violate T-duality, as the W_7-obstruction vanishes on a manifold of the form $S^1 \times X^9$). The appearance of the 4-dimensional obstruction may be somewhat surprizing. However, such obstruction occurs in the other types of string theory, namely type I and heterotic, where it relates the w_4 to the 4-form of the gauge field. If the gauge field is 0, we get precisely the obstruction $w_4 = 0$. We think that in sector in which our elliptic partition function applies, type II string theory becomes unified with other string theories, which is the reason why we are seeing a unified obstruction. More precise proposals will be made in follow-up work.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we study the Chern-Simons construction for the five-form, and we prove the vanishing fo the spin cobordism group $\tilde{\Omega}_{11}^{spin}(K(\mathbb{Z}, 6))$, which was conjectured by Witten. This fact, in fact, is interesting on its own, as it eliminates another potential θ-angle in type IIB string theory. We also comment on the construction of the intermediate Jacobian for cohomology, making a connection to the work of Hopins and Singer.

In section 3 we review Witten's construction of the RR partition function in cohomology and in K-theory, and provide some details for the case of H_3-twisted K-theory.

In section 4 we give the argument that there is no Diaconescu-Moore-Witten anomaly in ordinary untwisted 10-dimensional type IIB partition function.

In section 5 we discuss the main topic which is the S-duality puzzle and previous attempts and suggestions to resolve it, and also provide homotopy-theoretical evidence why a straightforward solution to the S-duality puzzle, using some generalized twisting of K-theory, does not seem possible.

In section 6, we propose in detail our possible approach to the S-duality problem using elliptic cohomology, and also write down the θ-bundle construction, which is the main step of the partition function construction, in this elliptic cohomology context. This is a unification of the IIA elliptic cohomology partition function correction of [24] and the IIB K^1-partition function construction of [12].

Having proposed a solution to the S-duality problem, one must address T-duality. In [24] we found that the cancellation of the Diaconescu-Moore-Witten anomaly in type IIA required the formulation of the partition function in terms of elliptic cohomology. How are the two pictures compatible? We address this question in section 7.

2 The partition function and the Chern-Simons construction

We start by reviewing Witten's construction. In order to study the partition function, one has to integrate over the space of fields. At the level of cohomology, one would also like to interpret the partition function as a section of a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ over the intermediate Jacobian J^5, such that the first Chern class $c_1(\mathcal{L})$ equals the polarization, or symplectic form, ω of J^5. Witten showed that using the Chern-Simons construction one can always find a line bundle with $c_1 = 2\omega$, and further, that in order to get one with $c_1 = \omega$ (i.e. basically using level half) one has to have, for a closed twelve-dimensional spin manifold Z^{12}, that the intersection form on $H^6(Z^{12}, \mathbb{Z})$ be even, which is always the case. [2]

In the Chern-Simons construction, i.e. extending by a circle with a bounding spin structure and then taking a coboundary, one encounters an obstruction for extending the gauge "bundles" as the cobordism group $\Omega_{11}^{spin}\left(K(\mathbb{Z},6)\right)$. Witten conjectures [25] that this group should be zero because it is unlikely that a theta angle, parametrized by the dual group $Hom\left(\Omega_{11}^{spin}\left(K(\mathbb{Z},6)\right), U(1)\right)$, exists in type IIB string theory.

Spin cobordism is represented by a spectrum, which is usually denoted by $MSpin$. Thus, another way of writing the above cobordism group, interpreting it as a generalized homology group using the notation of spectra, is $MSpin_{11}K(\mathbb{Z},6) = \Omega_{11}^{spin}(K(\mathbb{Z},6))$. Recall that by a result of Milnor, $MSpin_{11}(*) = 0$, so it suffices to consider the reduced group $\widetilde{MSpin}_{11}K(\mathbb{Z},6) = \tilde{\Omega}_{11}^{spin}(K(\mathbb{Z},6))$. We want to show that this is zero. The point is that this is in the so-called *stable range.*

The word 'stable' is used in many different meanings in different contexts. The algebraic topology meaning, which we are referring to here, is actually related to the notion of stability of D-branes, but we are not interested in that at the moment. In algebraic geometry, on the other hand, for example a 'stable bundle' (or curve) is something quite different, controlling automorphisms. In algebraic topology, 'stable' means 'preserved under suspension'. Suspension ΣX of a space X is formed by taking the product $X \times [0,1]$ and identifying all the points $(x,0)$ to a single point, and all the points $(x,1)$ to another single point. Now the crucial property is that for any generalized homology theory E, we have a natural isomorphism

$$\tilde{E}_n(X) \cong \tilde{E}_{n+1}\Sigma X$$

---

[2] Recall that in M-theory, the even-ness of the intersection form on the fourth integral cohomology was equivalent to integrality of the Spin class $\lambda/2$, because of the factor

$$(-1)^{\int_{\Sigma_4}\lambda} \exp\left(i\int_{\Sigma_4} G_4\right) \tag{2.1}$$

that had to be well-behaved.

where $\tilde{E}_n$ denotes the generalized homology group. A similar relation holds also for cohomology. This is what we mean by saying that generalized homology (or cohomology) theories are stable. In physics, it is important that stable D-branes are classified by K-theory, i.e. a stable invariant. The two notions of stability are related, but as we already commented, we are not using that in this proof.

Now conversely, with very mild restrictions, essentially every stable invariant of spaces is represented by a generalized homology or cohomology theory. This means that many common invariants are not stable. Homotopy groups are one example. Nevertheless, there is always a natural homomorphism (called the suspension map)

$$\pi_n(X) \to \pi_{n+1}\Sigma X \tag{2.2}$$

and the Freudenthal suspension theorem asserts that (2.2) is in fact an isomorphism if $n \leq 2k$ and onto for $n = 2k+1$ where k is such number that

$$\pi_i(X) = 0$$

for $i \leq k$ (we say that the space X is *k-connected*). Because (2.2) is an isomorphism in this range of n, we refer to $n \leq 2k$ as the *stable range.* Note that by mere comparison of numbers, once n is in the stable range for X, then every suspension map

$$\pi_{n+i}\Sigma^i X \to \pi_{n+i+1}\Sigma^{i+1}X$$

is also an isomorphism for $i \geq 0$.

This led algebraic topologists to realize that there is a functor Σ^∞ of 'infinite suspension' from spaces to the 'stable world' i.e. generalized cohomology theories. For these purposes, actually, it is useful to think of generalized cohomology theories on a point set level, not just up to homotopy. From this point of view, they are referred to as spectra. The essential point is that for any generalized homology E, we have a natural isomorphism

$$\tilde{E}_n X \cong E_n \Sigma^\infty X$$

because generalized homology is a stable invariant! A similar relation also holds for generalized cohomology.

Now we have a map of spectra

$$\Sigma^\infty K(\mathbb{Z}, 6) \to \Sigma^6 H\mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.3}$$

Here the spectrum on the right hand side is integral homology suspended by 6. This means that when applying the homology theory represented by this spectrum to a space, the i'th integral homology group appears in dimension $i+6$. The map (2.3) comes simply from the fact that the 6'th integral cohomology group of $K(\mathbb{Z}, 6)$ is $\mathbb{Z}$. But by the Freudenthal suspension theorem, we can say what the map (2.3) does in homotopy groups. This is because $K(\mathbb{Z}, 6)$ is 5-connected (and in fact its only non-trivial homotopy group is $\mathbb{Z}$ in dimension 6), so by the Freudenthal suspension theorem we know that $\Sigma^\infty K(\mathbb{Z}, 6)$ has no non-trivial homotopy groups, except $\mathbb{Z}$ in dimension 6, in dimensions ≤ 11. It follows that the map (2.3) induces on homotopy groups an isomorphism in dimension ≤ 11, and an onto map in dimension 12 (simply because the right hand side has no homotopy in that dimension). Such map is referred to as a 12-equivalence. In general, an n-equivalence of spaces or spectra has the property that it induces an isomorphism of any connective generalized homology or cohomology theory in dimension $< n$, and an onto map in dimension n (connective means that the negative generalized homology resp. cohomology groups of a point are 0). This is a consequence of the Whitehead theorem.

Therefore, (2.3), which is a 12-equivalence, induces iso in dimensions less than twelve and onto map in dimension twelve in any connective generalized homology theory, of which $MSpin$ is an example. So all we need is

$$MSpin_{11}\Sigma^6 H\mathbb{Z} = H_5(MSpin, \mathbb{Z}) \tag{2.4}$$

(This is an interesting property of spectra: they are simultaneously generalized homology theories, and their arguments. Further, for spectra E, F, we have $E_nF = F_nE$. We refer the reader to [50] for this fact, as well as basic foundations of the theory of spectra, which should include all the properties used in this proof.) But now by Thom isomorphism, the right hand side of (2.4) is equal to $H_5(BSpin, \mathbb{Z})$, which is zero. [3]

We will next comment on the construction of the Jacobian over the integral cohomology torus. Recall that the theory has, in the RR sector, the field strengths F_{2p+1}, $p \leq 0 \leq 4$. In the case of trivial cohomology, $F_{2p+1} = dC_{2p}$. For $p = 2$ the field strength is self-dual $F_5 = *F_5$. This is analogous to the story of a self-dual scalar in 2 dimensions and the chiral 2-form theory on the M5 worldvolume [25] [12]. These are similar because of chirality in dimensions $4k+2$. The construction of the intermediate Jacobian (of cohomology) of the string and the fivebrane worldvolume theories should then be helpful for the type IIB case. Indeed this is the case as the work of Hopkins and Singer [26] suggests. Their construction of the line bundle works for any $Spin$-manifold M of dimension $4n-2$. Note that in order for their monodromy formula to work, they require that the cobordism group $MSpin_{4n-1}K(\mathbb{Z}, 2n)$ ($= H_{2n-1}(BSpin, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus MSpin_{4n-1}(*)$ as above) vanishes. Note that in our case, $n = 3$, we have proved above the vanishing of the corresponding cobordism group, and thus at the level of cohomology one can get the corresponding line bundle by applying the formalism of [26].

Note that in the special case when $X = T^{10}$, Dolan and Nappi [27] found the $SL(10, \mathbb{Z})$-invariant partition function for the chiral five-form. However, as they also indicate, their methods would not extend to manifolds with more nontrivial topology.

3 K^1 in type IIB

First we start by reviewing the appearance of K-theory in type IIB. The RR fields of type IIB, in the absence of branes and $NSNS$ fields, are determined by $K^1(X^{10})$ [20]. In the presence of $NSNS$ field H_3 then this was suggested in [20], and shown in [21] for the torsion case and later in [22] for nontorsion, to be the twisted group $K^1_H(X^{10})$. The formula for the RR field strengths was proposed in [28] to be the same as for type IIA theory,

$$\frac{F(x)}{2\pi} = \sqrt{\hat{A}(X)}ch(x) \tag{3.1}$$

---

[3] Note that the calculation of the other groups that occur in Type IIA and M-theory, such as $MSpin_iK(\mathbb{Z}, 4)$ for $i = 10, 11$ can be understood with the same philosophy. However, there one has to be careful in seperating *stable* and *unstable* parts, which correspond to additive and non-additive structures.

where now the element x has a slightly different interpretation. Since $K^1(X)$ is isomorphic to $\widetilde{K}^0(X \times S^1)$ [4] , the Chern character $ch(x)$ is an element of $H^{even}(X \times S^1)$, which, upon integration over S^1, maps to $H^{odd}(X)$. One aspect of the K-theory interpretation of the RR fields is that the torsion parts are also unified and one cannot make sense of torsion parts of seperate components of $F(x)$.

The construction of the theta functions was explained in [28] relying on the definitions in [12]. At the level of cohomology, on a ten-dimensional spin manifold, the potential C_4 with a self-dual field strength F_5, is topologically classified by a class $x \in H^5(X, \mathbb{Z})$, which is represented in de Rham cohomology by $F_5/2\pi$. The partition function is then constructed by summing over all values of x. This happens when one ignores the self-duality and imposes the conventional Dirac quantization. However, for a self-dual F_5, the partition function is not obtained by summing independently over all values of x, but rather [12] in terms of a theta function on $\mathcal{T} = H^5(X, U(1))$, which, in the absence of torsion in the cohomology of X, is the torus $H^5(X, \mathbb{R})/H^5(X, \mathbb{Z})$. Then the theta function is constructed by summing over a maximal set of "commuting" periods. In order to determine the line bundle over $\mathcal{T}$, whose section is the partition function, we need to detemine the the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-valued function $\Omega(x)$ on $H^5(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. As in the IIA case, this function obeys (for all x, $y \in H^5(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$)

$$\Omega(x + y) = \Omega(x)\Omega(y)(-1)^{x \cdot y} \tag{3.2}$$

where $x \cdot y$ is the intersection pairing on X, i.e. $\int_X x \cup y$. Again it is convenient to write it as $\Omega(x) = (-1)^{h(x)}$ for an integer-valued function that is defined mod 2.

Defining $\Omega(x)$ at the level of K-theory automatically includes forms of all odd dimensions [12]. Analogously to the IIA construction, we need $x \otimes \bar{y}$, which is in $K^2(X) = \widetilde{K}^0(X \times S^1 \times S^1)$, and define

$$(x, y) = \int_{X \times S^1 \times S^1} \hat{A}(X \times S^1 \times S^1) ch(x \otimes \bar{y}). \tag{3.3}$$

There is a subtlety in defining $\Omega(x)$ [12]. Replacing the element $x \otimes \bar{x}$ of $\widetilde{K}^0(X \times S^1 \times S^1)$ by its complex conjugate amounts to exchanging the two S^1 factors. In addition, this element is trivial if restricted to $X \times S^1 \times \{*\}$ or $X \times \{*\} \times S^1$. The two properties amount to saying that $x \otimes \bar{x}$ can now be interpreted as an element of the Real group $KR(X \times S^2)$, with the involution given by a reflection on one of the coordinates of S^2. [5] Now, by Bott periodicity of KR,

$$KR(X \times S^2) \cong KO(X) \tag{3.4}$$

which means that the element $x \otimes \bar{x}$ maps to an element $w \in KO(X)$ and then one can define [12] $h(x) = j(w)$, where $j(w)$ is the mod 2 index of the Dirac operator with values in w, which has no elementary formula in general, but for bundles w whose complexification is of the form $x \otimes \bar{x}$, then

$$j(w) = \int_X \hat{A}(X) ch(w) \quad \mathrm{mod} 2. \tag{3.5}$$

Having reviewed Witten's construction in K-theory, we next look at the twisted case, for which there is an analogous story. Since H_3-twisted K-theory is not ultimately the theory we are after for solving the S-duality problem, we will not attempt the whole construction but limit ourselves to certain aspects that follow rather directly from the construction in the case of K^0 in type IIA [23], which in turn is a generalization of [13] and [29] to the (nontrivial) H_3-twisted case.

---

[4] the reduced group, i.e. the subset of $K^0(X \times S^1)$ consisting of elements that are trivial when restricted to X.

[5] By collapsing $S^1 \times \{*\}$ and $\{*\} \times S^1$, one maps $S^1 \times S^1$ to S^2 and the reflection on one coordinate in S^2 is inherited from the map that exchanges the two factors of $S^1 \times S^1$.

In the presence of H-flux, the Ramond-Ramond fields F are determined by the twisted K-theory classes $x \in K(X,H)$ via the twisted Chern map

$$\frac{F(x)}{2\pi} = ch_H(x)\sqrt{\hat{A}(X)} \in H^{odd}(X,H). \tag{3.6}$$

As in the K^0 case [23], the conjugate of x, $\bar{x} \in K^1(X,-H)$

$$\frac{F(\bar{x})}{2\pi} = ch_{-H}(\bar{x})\sqrt{\hat{A}(X)} \in H^{odd}(X,-H) \tag{3.7}$$

The RR field equations of motion can be written as

$$dF = H_3 \wedge F \tag{3.8}$$

which, at the level of differential forms says that the RR fields determine elements in twisted cohomology, $H^{odd}(X,H)$, and at the level of cohomology this implies $H_3 \wedge F_n = 0$.

We again have a diagram (analogously to [23], and which was also essentially used in [30])

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K^1(X,H) \times K^1(X,-H) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "ch_H \times ch_{-H}"'] & K^0(X) \arrow[r, "\text{index}"] \arrow[d, "ch"] & \mathbb{Z} \arrow[d, "||"] \\
H^{odd}(X,H) \times H^{odd}(X,-H) \arrow[r] & H^{even}(X) \arrow[r, "\int_X \widehat{A}(X)\wedge"] & \mathbb{Z}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.9}$$

where the upper row contains the cup product pairing in twisted K-theory followed by the standard index pairing of elements of K-theory with the Dirac operator (and we have used Bott periodicity). The bottom horizontal arrows are cup product in twisted cohomology followed by cup product by $\widehat{A}(X)$ and by integration. By the Atiyah-Singer index theorem, the diagram (3.9) commutes. Therefore the normalization given to the Chern character in the definition of $\frac{F(x)}{2\pi}$ makes the pairings in twisted K-theory and twisted cohomology isometric.

Again here there is the subtlety in the self-duality $*F = F$, which would be resolved [12, 28] by interpreting this self-duality as a statement in the quantum theory and summing over half the fluxes, i.e. over a maximal set of commuting periods. The lattice is $\Gamma_{K_H} = K^1(X,H)/K^1(X,H)_{tors}$. This is isomorphic to the image of the modified Chern character homomorphism of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded rings,

$$\sqrt{\hat{A}(X)} \wedge ch_H : K^1(X,H) \to H^{odd}(X,H;\mathbb{R}) \tag{3.10}$$

(via a similar arguement as the untwisted case) and the kernel is $K^1(X,H)_{tors}$, the torsion subgroup. However, in this case, it would be desirable (to see whether it is possible) to construct the structures on the lattice in analogy to the twisted IIA case [23].

One possible approach to trying to understand the twisted case better is to have a better understanding of the twisted backgrounds. This may include understanding the role of *higher twisting*. Higher twistings have been used in the work of Freed, Hopkins and Teleman on the Verlinde algebra [31] [32]. For complex K-theory, by [33], a twisting of complex K-theory over X is a principal $BU_{\otimes}$-bundle over that space. By (5.7), this is a pair (δ,τ) consisting of a *determinant* *twisting* δ, which is a $K(\mathbb{Z},2)$-bundle over X, and a *higher twisting* τ, which is a $BSU_{\otimes}$-torsor, so that twistings are classified, up to isomorphism, by a pair of classes $[\delta] \in H^3(X,\mathbb{Z})$ and $[\tau]$ in the generalized cohomology group $H^1(X, BSU_{\otimes})$. This group is not very simple to deal with over $\mathbb{Z}$, but becomes more manageable over $\mathbb{Q}$, where it coefficient $BSU_{\otimes}$ becomes a topological abelian group, isomorphic to $\prod_{n\geq 2} K(\mathbb{Q}, 2n)$ via the logarithm of the Chern character ch. In this latter case, Teleman then asserts [33] that the twistings of rational K-theory over X are classified, up to isomorphism, by the group $\prod_{n>1} H^{2n+1}(X,\mathbb{Q})$.

One place where it seems that higher twisting of K-theory does show up is in considering non-abelian spacetime. It is a well known fact that the B-field, whose field strength is H_3, measures non-commutativity of spacetime. In this section, we propose why higher twisting may be relevant from this geometric point of view.

First of all, mathematically, an infinitesimal deformation of any structure is measured by its first Quillen cohomology [34]. Now for example flat spacetime is characterized by its ring of functions, which is (up to some completion) roughly a polynomial algebra. Now in the category of rings, 1st Quillen cohomology is 2nd Hochschild cohomology, which, for the polynomial algebra R, is simply the space of possible violations of commutativity, i.e. the space of antisymmetric matrices over R, i.e. B fields.

This predicts that perhaps the string moduli space should contain backgrounds whose spacetimes have spaces of functions which are global non-commutative rings. We do not know if the IIA and IIB theory can indeed be fully recovered for such backgrounds, although it is worth noting that K theory of non-commutative topological rings makes sense. Using Serre-Swan theorem one can define for a not necessarily commutative ring A, $K_0(A)$ as the group defined by the semigroup of isomorphism classes of finite projective A-modules. The definition of $K_1(A)$ follows the same pattern as the commutative case, provided A is a Banach algebra. Bott periodicity extends to all Banach algebras.

There is also an intermediate step, i.e. "perturbative" non-commutative geometry in the sense of Connes [35]. This is defined in a similar fashion as a super-manifold: a manifold X together with a "structure sheaf", or a bundle of non-commutative algebras. Atiyah and Segal [36] comment that while a B-field is precisely the data needed by twisting K-theory cohomologically, a B-field realized by such non-commutative algebra bundle gives therefore Connes' non-commutative geometry. To have a bundle of non-commutative algebras, however, we first have a bundle of their indecomposibles, i.e. a vector bundle, which defines an element of K-theory.

4 The Diaconescu-Moore-Witten anomaly

Here we show that there is no Diaconescu-Moore-Witten anomaly in the ordinary untwisted IIB partition function. In computing the quadratic structure Ω, we took a class x in K-theory (K^1 in case of IIB), and by multiplying it by its conjugate, created a class in real K-theory ($KR^{1+\alpha}X \cong KR^0X$ in IIB) and then capped with the KR theory fundamental class to get the mod 2 index. Witten's method for identifying the anomaly is to choose a polarization of the form ω, i.e. a maximal isotropic space. On such space W, there exists a characteristic, i.e. an element θ such that for $x \in W$, $\Omega(x) = \langle x, \theta\rangle$ (considering $\Omega(x) \in \mathbb{Z}/2$).

Now Witten takes a polarization compatible with the AHSS. For IIA, this is the dual of K-theory elements supported on the k-skeleton, for $k > 5$, in the AHSS. Witten then argues that the characteristic must be supported in the AHSS in dimension four. The filtration degree in real AHSS we need to get to is 8 (to apply the mod 2 index, which lands in KO^2), so a priori one can take the characteristic to be supported in filtration degrees ≥ 4 (which is, from the point of view of this pairing, dual to W).

The same subtle argument can be applied to IIB. Of course, there is no canonical polarization, but we can take simply some isotropic subspace of the Ω-dual of K^1-theory elements supported on the > 5-skeleton in the AHSS. This amounts to just selecting some polarization of the part supported in cohomological dimension 5. Now for such choice of W, although not canonical, this time the characteristic can be taken supported in filtation degrees ≥ 5. The point is, again, the mod 2 index is supposed to end up in KO^2, but we also apply the $1 + \alpha$ shift. So, it seems that even before the shift, we want the complementary degree in the (cohomology) AHSS to be -8, so -4 for one class x, which occurs in filtration degree 5.

Then the only non-trivial dimension is 5. So the question will be analogous to IIA: Can there be a class $a = \theta$ in $H^5(X, \mathbb{Z})$ which supports a differential in the AHSS? This is not possible, as we argued before: if $d_3 a = b$ then choose $c \in H^2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ with $b \cup c$ not divisible by 2 (Poincaré duality). But then c must support a d_3 in the AHSS but that cannot happen, because second cohomology is represented by maps to CP^∞, hence any second cohomology class lifts to K-theory. Therefore there is no Diaconescu-Moore-Witten anomaly in the ordinary 10-dimensional untwisted IIB partition function.

Note that this observation does not violate ordinary untwisted T-duality in the canonical case: when $X_{10} = X_9 \times S^1$ and everything is $Spin$, then one must have $W_7(X_{10}) = W_7(X_9) = 0$ for the usual reason that βSq^6 when applied to the fundamental homology class of X_9 would have to be an integral homology class in dimension 2, which is again impossible by Poincaré duality.

5 S-duality and K-theory

5.1 The puzzle

Diaconescu, Moore and Witten [13] discuss the apparent incompatability of twisted K-theory and S-duality. In order to have an $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ symmetry, the monodromies of τ should be trivial, which implies that F_1, which determines the monodromies of $Re\tau$ should vanish (recall that $\tau = C_0 + ie^{-\phi}$). So the condition for anomaly cancellation (i.e. the W_3 story [37], see also [24]) for the next nontrivial field F_3 is $(Sq^3 + H_3) \cup F_3 = 0$. Now the pair H^i is expected to transform in the two-dimensional representation of the modular group. First, $\tau \to \tau + 1$, sending F_3 to $F_3 + H_3$ and H_3 to itself, encounters no problems since $H_3 \cup H_3 = Sq^3 H_3$ which implies that the anomaly equation is invariant. But it is not invariant under the full group, e.g. sending F to itself and H to $H_3 + F_3$. The $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$-invariant extension of the above equation is [13]

$$F_3 \cup H_3 + \beta Sq^2 (F_3 + H_3) = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

One immediate question is that of justification (and interpretation) of the term

$$\beta Sq^2 H_3 = H_3 \cup H_3. \tag{5.2}$$

The problem can be restated as finding an S-duality extension of d_3 in AHSS (see [16] for discussions on this point). There have been several proposals concerning this. The authors of [16] state that they have verified equation (5.1) for IIB configurations obtained by T-duality of M-theory on a torus, and proposed a nonlinear extension of the differentials. In [38] this problem was also addressed, focusing on the torsion components of the fields, starting from M-theory on a two-torus. Using their cubic refinement law for the M-theory phase and the quadratic refinement of the mod 2 index f, Diaconescu, Freed and Moore [38] also derived the $SL(2,\mathbb{Z})$-invariant equation of motion for the torsion fields,

$$Sq^3(F_3) + Sq^3(H_3) + F_3 \cup H_3 = P, \tag{5.3}$$

where P depends only on the topology and the spin structure of the nine-manifold, and is defined by

$$e^{i\pi f(a)} = \langle a, P \rangle. \tag{5.4}$$

Let us now attempt an explanation of the (5.2) term in the equation (5.1). First of all, recall say from [36], Proposition 4.1, how one derives the differential d_3 in the twisted Atiyah-Hirzebruch spectral sequence: the term (5.2) must be explicitly excluded, and the argument for excluding it is that one should have, in the twisted K-theory AHSS,

$$d_3(0) = 0. \tag{5.5}$$

Therefore, the presence of the term (5.2) indicates that (5.5) must be violated in the K-theoretical intepretation of IIB. In other words, the equation (5.1), for a given H_3, is not linear in F_3 and this is forced if we want to have modularity between the H_3 and F_3 fields.

In what way do we have to modify twisted K-theory to allow for a violation of (5.5)? First, let us recall which twisted generalized cohomology theories we call twisted K-theory. A twisted generalized cohomology theory is a bundle of cohomology theories on X. So, for twisted K-theory, we would like the fiber over each point of X to be K-theory. However, this condition is not enough. We would get a lot more "twisted K-theories" if we only imposed that condition. The salient point is that we also insist that twisted K-theory be a *module* over K-theory, which forces the "structure group" of the bundle of K-theories in question to be the multiplicative infinite loop space $GL_1(K)$ of K-theory. We have (see e.g. [33])

$$GL_1(K) = BU^{\otimes} \sim \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{C}P^{\infty} \times BSU \tag{5.6}$$

Aside from the twistings coming from the group $\{\pm 1\}$, the splitting (5.6) refines to a decompostion of the spectrum $BU_{\otimes}$ of 1-dimensional units in the classifying spectrum for complex K-theory [39] so that one has the factorization

$$BU_{\otimes} \cong K(\mathbb{Z}; 2) \times BSU_{\otimes}. \tag{5.7}$$

Now if we have a violation of (5.5), clearly we cannot be dealing with a K-theory module. Can we then have some further generalized twisting, where, for a particular H_3, the choice of allowable F_3's would not form a vector space? In other words, could one consider a form of twisted K-theory which is not a module cohomology theory over ordinary K-theory?

5.2 Generalized $K(\mathbb{Z},3)$-twisted K-theory, and homotopy theory

In this section, we will show that the kind of theory described in the end of the last subsection, also cannot exist if the twisting space is $K(\mathbb{Z},3)$. However, first we have to understand what its existence would mean in terms of homotopy theory. So far, we have only exhibited one differential, or obstruction, (5.1) for the cohomological pair (H_3, F_3) to lift to the theory. For the theory to actually exist, we would have to exhibit a *classifying space*, i.e. a topological space $\mathcal{B}$ such that our affine-twisted K^1-group would be classified by homotopy classes of maps

$$X \to \mathcal{B}. \tag{5.8}$$

As it turns out, such space cannot exist. To understand this, the reader should review the Appendix for the construction of the space classifying K^1_{tw}.[6] We see then that the space $\mathcal{B}$ should sit in a fibration[7]

$$SU \to \mathcal{B} \to K(\mathbb{Z},3). \tag{5.9}$$

Then its Postnikov tower would have again the factors (7.9), but the lowest Postnikov invariant should now be given by the equation (5.1) instead of (7.11).

Now applying the loop functor Ω (ΩX is the space of all maps $S^1 \to X$ preserving selected base points) to (5.9), and taking suitably rigid models, we get an extension of topological groups

$$BU \to \Omega B \to \mathbb{C}P^\infty. \tag{5.10}$$

We will investigate ΩB as a homotopy associative H-space[8]. First, since BU is commutative up to homotopy, (5.10) gives rise to a well defined action up to homotopy

$$\mathbb{C}P^\infty \times BU \to BU. \tag{5.11}$$

Now actions up to homotopy of the form (5.11) can be classified. For our purposes, it suffices to consider actions which act through H-space homomorphisms, i.e. preserve the group structure of BU up to homotopy.

Now maps $BU \to BU$ are characteristic classes in K-theory, among which the additive ones are linear combinations of the Segre classes (otherwise known as Adams operations) ψ_n, which take a line bundle to its n'th power. Note that the composition of Adams operations is

$$\psi_m \circ \psi_n = \psi_{m+n},$$

so if we write a^n for ψ_n, one can write (5.11) as a power series with integral coefficients in two variables

$$\phi(x,a),$$

---

[6] When not referring to a particular space, we use the notation K_{tw} for twisted K-theory.

[7] Here by fibration, or more precisely a fibered sequence, we mean a sequence of spaces

$$F \to E \to B$$

where $E \to B$ is a fibration, which means roughly that E is fibered without singularities over B (more precisely that it satisfies the homotopy lifting property), and the fiber is F. Any map in topology may, up to homotopy, be replaced by a fibration, so this places no homotopical restriction on the map $E \to B$.

[8] Recall that a H-space is a topological group up to homotopy.

and the condition that (5.11) is an action up to homotopy reads

$$\phi(x,a)\cdot\phi(y,a)=\phi(x+y+xy,a). \tag{5.12}$$

To make this clearer, note that after rewriting formally

$$\phi(x,a)=\Phi(1+x,a),$$

(5.12) becomes

$$\Phi(1+x,a)\cdot\Phi(1+y,a)=\Phi((1+x)(1+y),a)$$

to which clearly the only solutions are

$$\phi(x,a)=\Phi(1+x,a)=(1+x)^m,\ m\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.13}$$

Therefore, ϕ cannot depend on a. What we have proven is that at least up to homotopy, the only actions (5.11) are ordinary twistings of K-theory by m'th power of the line bundle. Moreover, to get the exactly the multiplicative term in the Postnikov invariant (5.1), we must have $m=1$.

We now continue our classification of the homotopy H-spaces (5.10). Now that the action (5.11) has been identified, extensions (5.10) up to homotopy are classified by a cohomology group which we can roughly write as a "group cohomology"

$$H^2(\mathbb{C}P^\infty,BU) \tag{5.14}$$

where $\mathbb{C}P^\infty$ acts on BU by the action (5.11), which is (5.13) with $m=1$. More precisely, if $[X,Y]$ denotes homotopy classes of maps from X to Y, then (5.14) is a cohomology group

$$[\mathbb{C}P^\infty,BU]\xrightarrow{d_1}[\mathbb{C}P^\infty\times\mathbb{C}P^\infty,BU]\xrightarrow{d_2}[\mathbb{C}P^\infty\times\mathbb{C}P^\infty\times\mathbb{C}P^\infty,BU]. \tag{5.15}$$

Using the fact that $K^0((\mathbb{C}P^\infty)^{\times n})$ is the ring of integral power series in n variables (copies of the canonical complex orientation of K-theory), we may write an element in the middle term as a power series with integral coefficients

$$f(x,y),$$

and then using (5.13) for $m=1$, we have

$$(d_2f)(x,y,z)=f(x+y+xy,z)-f(x,y+z+yz)+f(x,y)(1+z)$$

and similarly

$$(d_1g)(x,y)=g(x+y+xy)-g(x)(1+y).$$

As before, things become clearer when we formally rewrite

$$f(x,y)=F(1+x,1+y),$$

$$g(x)=G(1+x).$$

The differential then becomes

$$d_2f=F((1+x)(1+y),(1+z))-F(1+x,(1+y)(1+z))+(F(1+x,1+y))(1+z),$$

$$d_1g=G((1+x)(1+y))-(G(1+x))(1+y).$$

This however is the standard pattern of the cobar construction with repeat term, which has no higher cohomology: indeed, if

$$d_2 f = 0,$$

then

$$f = d_1 g \tag{5.16}$$

where

$$g(x) = G(1+x) = F(1, 1+x) = f(0, x).$$

To see this, calculate

$$d_1 g = F(1, (1+x)(1+y)) - (F(1, 1+x))(1+y),$$

while

$$0 = d_2 f(1, x, y) = F(1+x, 1+y) - F(1, (1+x)(1+y)) + (F(1, 1+x))(1+y),$$

thus proving (5.16).

We have therefore shown that the cohomology group (5.14) vanishes, so at $m = 1$, ordinary twisted K-theory is the only candidate for $\Omega\mathcal{B}$ in the extension (5.10) as homotopy associative H-spaces. Now recall that when we apply the loop functor Ω to *any* fibration of topological spaces (5.9), we obtain (upon selecting an appropriately rigid model) an extension of topological groups (5.10), and that this extension moreover determines the fibration (5.9). Now we have classified the extension (5.10) on the level of H-spaces, which is weaker than topological groups. A priori, this does not exclude the possibility that some subtle higher invariant could further distinguish between the extensions of topological groups (5.10). However, the *first* Postnikov invariant of $\mathcal{B}$ (the one which goes from dimension 3 to dimension 6) is determined by the structure of $\Omega\mathcal{B}$ as homotopy associative H-space. Therefore, we have shown that (5.1) cannot occur as first Postnikov invariant of a space sitting in the fibration (5.9). In other words, no version of $K(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$-twisted K-theory, i.e. no theory which would be classified by a space $\mathcal{B}$ sitting in a fibration sequence of the form (5.9), can be compatible with S-duality, which is needed to solve the puzzle of [13].

5.3 Even more general twisted K-theory?

We have shown that no generalized $K(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$-twisted K-theory solves the problem of producing a theory which would explain the equation (5.1). ¿From a physics point of view, one might ask whether any kind of higher-twisted K-theory might solve the problem. In particular, it seems reasonable to ask whether K-twisted K-theory should play a role. If so, then that would imply a symmetry between the RR fields and the NSNS fields. Let us discuss how one might form "NSNS fields" in odd degrees. Of course, we have the standard field H_3. Aside from H_7 the dual of H_3, one can also include the field strength de^{φ} of the dilaton φ, which is of degree one, its dual, and also the five-form field strength since it is duality-symmetric. One then has forms of all odd degrees less than ten, and one might then argue, in analogy to the situation with the RR fields, that they form a total Neveu-Schwarz field

$$H_{NS} = \sum_n H_{2n+1} \tag{5.17}$$

where H_{2n+1} are the individual fields identified above. This might then be viewed as a K-theory element which provides the higher twisting for the Ramond-Ramond fields, since as we saw earlier, rationally are of the form [33]

$$\prod_n H^{2n+1}(X, \mathbb{Q}). \tag{5.18}$$

But where would one look for such theory? First of all, recall again that ordinary higher-twisted module K-theory is not really K-twisted, but $gl_1(K)$-twisted, which involves the factors $K(\mathbb{Z}, 2) \times BSU$, so using this, one still does not get the (5.1) equation. Also, the self-dual F_5 in fact places doubts on any hope that a (K, K)-approach to IIB could give S-duality: Bott periodicity, which is intrinsic to K-theory, has a physical interpretation in tachyonic condensation where it shows up as a Gysin map. This periodicity relates all the fields F_{2i+1}. Now there is no obvious physical argument why the NS-NS-fields should be related by such construction. Even if this were the case, one would have to explain how come the construction passes through the self-dual F_5 field and returns back to NS-NS fields.

It is difficult to make a pursuasive argument that *no* twisting of K-theory could possibly work. The reason is that it is difficult to specify what exactly one would mean by the most general kind of twisting. For example, Zhang [40] defines K-twisted K-theory as cohomology of a complex

$$\xrightarrow{\alpha} K^0(X) \xrightarrow{\alpha} K^1(X) \xrightarrow{\alpha} K^0(X) \xrightarrow{\alpha}$$

where $\alpha \in K^1(X)$ is a class, and makes calculations with this construction. Now although a theory of this type can lead to valuable calculations, even defining it however depends on calculational properties of $K^*(X)$ (one must have $\alpha^2 = 0$ – a priori it is only 2-torsion, which is precisely where the subtleties lie with the equation (5.1)).

In homotopy theory, the desirable property would be that our hypothetical theory, let us call it $\mathcal{K}^1$ should be representable, which means one should have

$$\mathcal{K}^1(X) = [X, \mathcal{B}]$$

for some space $\mathcal{B}$. Now one may ask what type of space we allow as $\mathcal{B}$. Further, if we are referring to a twisting of K-theory, we should at least have a fibration

$$SU \to \mathcal{B} \to T \tag{5.19}$$

for some space T. In the previous section, we have excluded $T = K(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$ as a candidate. But what most general choice of T should we allow? A homotopy theorist might answer $T = BG$ where G is the monoid of self-maps $BU \to BU$ either as a space or as an infinite loop space. However, one could go even more general. For example, one could argue that K-theory of K-theory should also be considered a twisting of K-theory. This was calculated by Baas-Dundas-Rognes [44], and shown to be related to elliptic cohomology, which we will consider in the next section.

In general, homotopy theory allows us to say this: since we have the field H_3, and can neglect lower dimensions for the purposes of deriving our condition, we can assume the space T of (5.19) is 2-connected and has

$$\mathbb{Z} \subset \pi_3(T). \tag{5.20}$$

We should be more precise here: of course we are interested in situations where spacetime X would not be simply connected. So, the most general kind of fibration we should consider is in fact

$$U \to \mathcal{B} \to T. \tag{5.21}$$

However, for the purpose of merely deriving a condition on (5.21), we may take a 2-connected cover of all terms of (5.21), and still have a fibration sequence. Then we get (5.19) with T 2-connected.

Now we can then ask what Postnikov invariants (also called k-invariants) are attached to the generator (5.20)? By the result of the last section, at least one of those k-invariants must be non-zero. Now assuming $\pi_4(T) = 0$ (since we do not see an obvious 4-dimensional field), the lowest possible k-invariant of T is

$$k_3(H_3) \in H^6(K(\mathbb{Z}, 3), \pi_5(T)).$$

But if this k-invariant is non-zero, it alters, by definition, the equation (5.1), because the target of the k-invariant considered there is $H^6(K(\mathbb{Z}, 3), \pi_5(SU))$, which is a different term of the fibration (5.19). Assuming, however, that the lowest k-invariant of H_3 is in $H^n(K(\mathbb{Z}, 3), \pi_{n-1}(T))$ for $n > 3$, we see that the space T cannot be a form of K-theory or ordinary cohomology, since in those theories, all classes with non-trivial k-invariants have a non-trivial k_3. We see therefore that one way or another, we are led to some type of other theory than K-theory or ordinary cohomology.

6 Elliptic cohomology

Let us now drop the restriction that the theory we are searching for be a priori a twisting of K-theory. Let us recapitulate the requirements we have on a theory which used to calculate the IIB partition function:

1. S-duality, i.e. modularity with respect to H, F

2. Higher generalized cohomology - at least a 2'nd generalized cohomology group must be defined in our theory to imitate the untwisted K^1-partition function construction reviewed above

3. T-duality with IIA, which should in some form extend to the > 10-dimensional limits.

In the last section, we concluded that 1 cannot be satisfied by any generalization of $K(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$-twisted K-theory. However, 2 casts doubt on the viability of any twisted generalized cohomology approach: when the twisting space is introduced into the theory, an intrinsic non-commutativity is introduced which seems to prevent further "delooping" of the theory into a modular second cohomology group. It therefore seems that a candidate for the theory we are searching for, should be, after all, an *untwisted* generalized cohomology theory. But how could the twisting of K-theory untwist in another cohomology theory which carries at least the same amount of information? There is some evidence for an answer. Douglas [41] notes that twistings of K-theory result in maps

$$K(\mathbb{Z}, 3) \to TMF,$$

in fact defining "elliptic line bundles". Therefore, what looks like twisting to the eyes of K-theory, untwists and becomes merely a multiplication by a suitable element in TMF or any suitable form of elliptic cohomology.

One can in fact push this a bit further: the geometric interpretation of ordinary cohomology twisting of K-theory is as a gerbe [42] [22]. However, a gerbe should only be a special case of a 2-vector space bundle. The problem is that this intuition has not yet been made precise mathematically: a 2-vector space should be a lax module (in the sense of [43]) over the symmetric bimonoidal category $\mathbb{C}_2$ of finite-dimensional complex vector spaces. Naively, a 2-vector space over X would just be a bundle, assigning to each point x of X, continuously a 2-vector space $\mathcal{V}_x$. One could then define $\mathcal{V}$-twisted K-theory simply as a the K-theory of the category of continuous sections of $Obj(\mathcal{V}_x)$, as x varies. The problem with making this mathematically precise is that the 2-category of 2-vector spaces is unexpectedly rigid, and there are not enough equivalences to get good examples of 2-bundles. Solutions to this problem have been proposed ([44, 43]), but it is fair to say that so far these structures have not been investigated in detail. The main point is that it seems that a suitable "group completion" of $\mathbb{C}_2$ must be found, i.e. a category of super-vector spaces with well behaved inverse. One mathematical way one can talk rigorously about the 2-vector space twistings of K-theory is via the spaces $GL_n(K)$,whose limit determines the algebraic K-theory of the E_∞ ring spectrum K. In any case, from the work of Baas-Dundas-Rognes [44], we expect that 2-vector spaces, with perhaps some extra structure, also determine elliptic cohomology (or TMF) elements, so this type of twisting by a higher-dimensional 2-vector bundle would also untwist in elliptic cohomology.

Another hint that twisted K-theory should lead up to elliptic cohomology is the result of Freed, Hopkins and Teleman [32] relating the Verlinde algebra of a compact Lie group to its (ordinary cohomology-twisted) equivariant K-theory. Perhaps by considering the full force of twisting, one could cohomologically explain the full anomaly of the chiral WZW models? But anomaly of chiral CFT is kind of "1-st CFT cohomology" information, and we think that elliptic cohomology and "CFT cohomology" are related (*cf.* [45]).

In any case, we have now gathered some evidence that the theory we are searching for, which would satisfy 1, 2, should be elliptic cohomology. In elliptic cohomology, the both fields H_3 and F_3 play symmetrical roles, and twisting is replaced by multiplication. Thus, the equation (5.1) is replaced by requiring that both H_3, F_3 be represented by elements of elliptic cohomology. But this also dovetails with point 3: In [24], we proposed that a correction of the IIA partition function in the case of the M-theory limit should be defined by elliptic cohomology. It is therefore natural that the theory containing the partition function of the T-dual IIB theory should also be elliptic cohomology. There is in fact a physical argument why a *modular* theory should involve the higher-dimensional high energy limits: K theory predicts periodicity of the RR-fields, but the dual NS-NS fields do not seem to share such periodicity. Therefore, to have a modular picture, we need to consider a theory which breaks the periodicity of RR-fields. However, it seems that this periodicity is only broken when a strong-type coupling limit leading to dimensional expansion of spacetime is introduced.

Also the fact that S-duality is a part of U-duality gives an argument why we should be led to higher dimension in considering IIB modularity: we have a path in the string moduli space connecting a theory to its U-dual. In the case of IIA theory, it has been shown that in the limit, the theory expands to 11-dimensions, and therefore the theory must be at least 11-dimensional also on the path in the string moduli space. In fact, dimensional expansion is a kind of condition which should be generic in the moduli space. Therefore, in the path in the moduli space connecting IIB with its U-dual, we should also see $>$ 10-dimensional theories in the interior of the path, even though both limit theories are 10-dimensional (we think, in fact, that the correct number of dimensions is 12; in future work, we shall obtain evidence confirming that proposal).

Let us recapitulate what we concluded up to this point: If we want to understand S-duality in type IIB string theory, we must find a way of twisting F_3 by H_3 which is compatible with S-duality. To do that, we must look beyond any kind of $K(\mathbb{Z},3)$-twisted K-theory. One possible approach is to look for a generalized cohomology theory where the twisting untwists, i.e. H_3 is just represented by a class in the theory. Such theory is elliptic cohomology. However, if we select elliptic cohomology as an approach to the IIB S-duality puzzle, we have also expanded the theory. In other words, we are no longer in the situation of classical IIB string theory, but in some dimensional expansion of that theory.

There remains a question which exact type of elliptic cohomology theory one should use. The trouble is that mathematics has not yet perfected the connection between elliptic cohomology and geometrical or physical objects such as gerbes or 2-vector spaces. Many variations of constructions originating from such objects can be made, leading to slightly different elliptic cohomology theories. We do not have a definitive answer as to which theory to use (a similar difficulty was encountered in [24]). In algebraic topology, this difficulty is circumvented by observing certain common features of elliptic cohomology theories, and considering them therefore, in a way, all at once.

The "ultimate" elliptic cohomology theory (which however is no longer an elliptic cohomology theory in the standard definition) is TMF, and will pursue this point in a follow-up paper [46]. In this paper, we shall simply show that complex-oriented elliptic cohomology theory we used in [24] can be used as a kind of toy model. It is easier to analyze mathematically, and in fact one can build, at least at free field approximation, a physical quantum theory based on elliptic cohomology whose partition function is directly analogous to the K-theory partition function introduced in [12], [13] which serves as an approximation of the type II partition function, and which was reviewed above. The question is what exact role this theory plays. We have concluded above that this theory serves as partition function of some dimensional expansion of type IIB string theory which has S-duality.

In [12], [13], to correctly understand the phases necessary to define the type II partition function, it was necessary to involve real K-theory in addition to complex K-theory. Similarly, in the elliptic theory, to get correct phases for its partition function, one must involve real elliptic cohomology. Passage to a real form of a complex-oriented theory however entails an obstruction. In the case of K-theory, it was shown in [13] that the correct obstruction in the untwisted case is W_7. In Section 4 above, we have shown that in IIB, in the untwisted case, there is no such obstruction. We observed however in [24] that in real elliptic cohomology, the obstruction is stronger: the 10-dimensional compact spacetime *Spin*-manifold X must satisfy the condition

$$w_4(X) = 0, \tag{6.1}$$

which is a necessary and sufficient condition for orientation with respect to real elliptic cohomology. A physical interpretation of this seemingly foreign condition will be proposed below.

Now the partition function is getting a θ-function. Its construction in the IIB case is directly analogous to [12]. Instead of $K^1(X)$, one starts with $E^1(X)$ where E is complex-oriented elliptic cohomology. The construction proceeds precisely analogously as in the $K^1(X)$ case. The only delicate point which requires explicit discussion is the phase. There, too, we have an analogy, but we must make sure all steps of the analogy make sense. We have the pairing in $E^1(X)$:

$$E^1(X) \otimes E^1(X) \to E^2(X) \to E^{-8} = E^0 \tag{6.2}$$

where the second map is capping with the fundamental orientation class in $E_{10}(X)$. To construct a θ-function, however, we need a quadratic structure, for which, just as in the case of IIA, we need to consider real elliptic cohomology: A product of an $x \in E^1(X)$ with itself can be given a real structure, which just as in the case of KR-theory reviewed above, gives rise to an element of

$$\omega(x) \in E\mathbb{R}^{1+\alpha}X. \tag{6.3}$$

But now capping (6.3) with the fundamental orientation class in $E\mathbb{R}_{10}(X)$, we obtain an element in $E^{\alpha-9}$. As remarked in [24], this is a $\mathbb{Z}/2$-vector space generated by the classes

$$v_1^{3n-1}v_2^{2-n}\sigma^{-4}a^2,\ n \geq 1.$$

Therefore, we get a quadratic structure depending on one free parameter, which leads to a precise IIB analog of the θ-function constructed for IIA using real elliptic cohomology in [24].

7 The w_4 obstruction, IIA-strings and T-duality

Why would there be a 4-dimensional obstruction such as (6.1) to construction of partition function in any type II string theory? Such condition (on λ, the four-dimensional characteristic class of the tangent bundle equaling that of the gauge bundle) is present in type I and heterotic string theory, but not in 10-dimensional type II theory. The direct answer is, as we noted above, that we have left the confines of classical type II string theory, and passed to its dimensional expansion. So what we see is that we have an additional obstruction which must vanish in order for this expansion to be exist. This is perfectly consistent. But why is the obstruction exactly w_4?

In [24], we saw that analysing the conjectured M-theory limit of IIA string theory, the W_7 anomaly of Diaconescu-Moore-Witten [13] gets refined to w_4 (the obstruction to orientability with respect to real elliptic cohomology) or even $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}/24$ (the obstruction to orientability with respect to tmf). Now we observed above that the W_7 anomaly does not show up in ordinary untwisted IIB-theory, but in the last section reached the conclusion that elliptic cohomology (or TMF) should really be the theory describing the behavior of IIB, in which case the obstruction w_4 (or $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}/24$) reappears. How does this relate to T-duality? What is then the role of a 4-dimensional obstruction in IIB when there are no 4-dimensional RR-fields in IIB? The answer, perhaps, should be that the reason we see the same obstruction for all string theories is that we are considering dimensional expansion, which, as observed above, should be a generic phenomenon in the string moduli space. In this expansion, perhaps, all string theories should be unified (the moduli space should be connected), and this is why the obstructions merge. What is, however, the right number of dimensions?

Physically, one can argue that the two theories, IIA and IIB, are not completely symmetrical in ten dimensions. Note that certain topological terms on the M-theory (and consequently the IIA-) side that do not come from corresponding terms in the IIB side. For example, the one-loop topological term

$$\int_{Y^{11}} C_3 \wedge I_8 \tag{7.1}$$

in M-theory, which reduces to the term

$$\int_{X^{10}} B_2 \wedge I_8 \tag{7.2}$$

in type IIA, does not match a corresponding term in IIB [47]. Instead, there are terms, that depend inversely on the radius of the extra circle in nine dimensions, that make the matching possible, and that tend to zero as the tenth dimension (up to IIB) is decompactified [47]. So if topological terms are not traced back to similar terms, then there could be a mismatch if one wants to look at the full story in the context of the E_8 bundle in eleven (and twelve) dimensions. This is because the term (7.1) was an essential ingredient in Witten's formulation of the phase of M-theory as an E_8 index [9]. A complete discussion of the effect of T-duality on the partition function will perhaps involve the fermionic path integral as well as the one-loop corrections, as was found in [29] for the case of IIA on $X_8 \times T^2$. This would be beyond the scope of this paper.

On the other hand, IIB should have a 12-dimensional F-theory limit [10]. [11] Then there should also be T-duality which would somehow unify the F-theory limit of IIB with the conjectured 12-dimensional F-theory limit of M-theory (hence also IIA), although we must note that necessarily, both of the IIA and IIB limits should end up in quite different sectors of F-theory: For example, assuming there is an F-theory limit to IIB, the elliptic curve which is the fiber must have completely Ramond spin structure, i.e. no non-separating curve can bound. The point is, that is the only spin structure on an elliptic curve which does not break modularity. So, the elliptic fiber must have Ramond spin structure in order to preserve S-duality.

As noted, IIA should also have 12-dimensional limits. On one hand, implicitly or explicitly, one limit shows up in [13] in the form of the manifold Z whose boundary is the 11-dimensional spacetime of M-theory, which in turn is conjectured to be a strong coupling form of IIA. On the other hand, if the IIA-theory has an F-theory limit whose fiber is an elliptic curve, that fiber must have a spin structure which contains NS non-separating curves, because in the 11-dimensional M-theory whose spacetime is an S^1-bundle over X, the fiber must have NS-spin structure.

We see therefore that T-duality in the F-theory limits of IIA and IIB cannot be straightforward in the sense that it would simply keep the fiber intact. This is a possible explanation why in the ordinary untwisted 10-dimensional partition functions of IIA and IIB, the W_7-anomaly shows up in IIA but not in IIB, and also of the other apparent asymmetries between 10-dimensional IIA and IIB theories. Note however that T-duality in F-theory may be the key to explaining the role of the w_4-obstruction to the elliptic IIB partition function: Although we know little about the nature of F-theory at this point, it should however contain both the IIA and IIB fields. Therefore, it is no surprise that a 4-dimensional topological obstruction is relevant in any sector of F-theory.

There is also another, purely mathematical, intuition why orientability with respect to tmf should be relevant to string backgrounds. Stolz and Teichner [48] conjecture that tmf could be constructed as moduli space of supersymmetric conformal field theories. Such theories, in dimension 10 (more precisely $(9,1)$), determine 10-dimensional string backgrounds. Therefore, there should be a canonical tmf-class on the moduli space of 10-dimensional backgrounds which should be the Witten genus. This means that we should consider the Witten genus on spacetime manifolds, but we know that the Witten genus is well behaved precisely for manifolds which have a tmf-orientation.

---

[9] Of course, there is also the Rarita-Schwinger part.

[10] In this section, the word "limit" is not meant in the dynamical sense, but more in the geometric or topological sense.

[11] We note that at present, referring to F-theory is a little dangerous, since its precise physical form is not clarified. In particular, at physical signatures, no Lorentz-invariant formulation of F-theory is known so far. We shall return to this point in future work. For now, however, let us neglect this difficulty, and assume that a physically consistent F-theory has been developed.

The above issues deserve further investigation and we hope to revisit them in the near future [46].

Acknowledgements
We thank Edward Witten for emphasizing the importance of the problem and for discussion. We also acknowledge useful conversations with Jarah Evslin and Varghese Mathai. H. S. would like to thank the Michigan Center for Theoretical Physics for kind hospitality during the intermediate stages of this project.

Appendix: The homotopical construction of K^1_{tw}

We give here the construction of the classifying space $\mathcal{K}$ of "ordinary" twisted K^1-theory. Recall [49] that a monoidal category [12] is a category with a bifunctorial operation $+$ which is associative and unital (not necessarily commutative) up to natural isomorphisms which must satisfy appropriate coherence diagrams. It is in fact appropriate to call a monoidal category a *lax monoid*: the general rule of thumb is that for any algebraic structure, a *lax* verion of that structure is a category on which all the operations are defined and satisfy all their required identities (e.g. associativity, unit, etc.) up to natural isomorphisms, which in turn sit in commutative *coherence diagrams.* There is no point in going to too much detail about that here, but roughly speaking, imagine we can convert in the (strict) algebraic structure one expression into another using the defining identities in two different ways. Then, in the lax structure, these two ways define a required commutative coherence diagram.

Now for a monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$, its classifying space $B\mathcal{C}$ then has the natural structure of a topological monoid, of which we can then again take a classifying space $\mathbb{B}B\mathcal{C}$. (We deliberately use here different symbols B, $\mathbb{B}$ for the category and monoid classifying spaces, since these are different construction, and $\mathbb{B}$ is in fact with respect to the monoidal structure obtained from topological realization of the categorical operation $+$, whereas B is just done with respect to the structure of categorical composition.

Then the space $\mathcal{K}$ can be constructed as

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{B}B\mathcal{C} \tag{7.3}$$

where the monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$ has as objects pairs (L, V) where L is a 1-dimensional complex vector space and V is a finite-dimensional complex vector space, and as morphisms pairs of isomorphisms, and the operation is

$$(L, V) + (M, W) = (LM, LW + V). \tag{7.4}$$

The unit is $(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ and to see associativity, we have

$$(L, V) + (M, W) + (N, Z) = (LMN, LMZ + LW + V). \tag{7.5}$$

---

[12] A monoid is a group-like object that fails to be a group by lacking an inverse. It is also a semigroup (i.e. a set equipped with an associative product) with an indentity element.

In fact, there is further discussion one can have: The space $\mathcal{K}$ sits in a fibration

$$U \to \mathcal{K} \to K(\mathbb{Z}, 3).$$

Taking fixed loops, we get a fibration

$$BU \times \mathbb{Z} \to \Omega\mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{C}P^{\infty}, \tag{7.6}$$

but it is a well known fact that we can choose models of the spaces involved such that (7.6) is actually an extension of topological groups. In any case, since $\pi_1(\mathbb{C}P^{\infty}) = 0$, the fibration (7.6) does not twist the connected components of the fiber $BU \times \mathbb{Z}$, so, we may get a group extension by restricting the fiber to $BU \times \{0\}$:

$$BU \to \Omega\mathcal{K}_0 \to \mathbb{C}P^{\infty}, \tag{7.7}$$

and taking $\mathbb{B}$, we obtain a fibration

$$SU \to \mathcal{K}_\prime \to K(\mathbb{Z}, 3). \tag{7.8}$$

The Postnikov tower of this space $\mathcal{K}$ has stages

$$K(\mathbb{Z}, 3) \times K(\mathbb{Z}, 3), K(\mathbb{Z}, 5), K(\mathbb{Z}, 7), ... \tag{7.9}$$

and the first Postnikov invariant is the map

$$K(\mathbb{Z}, 3) \times K(\mathbb{Z}, 3) \to K(\mathbb{Z}, 6) \tag{7.10}$$

which is given by the equation

$$\beta Sq^2 F + H \cup F \tag{7.11}$$

where H, F are the characteristic 3-dimensional cohomology classes of the factors of the left hand side of (7.10).

References

[1] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, *Extended supergravity in ten dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B122** (1983) 143.

[2] N. Marcus and J. H. Schwarz, *Field theories that have no manifestly Lorentz-invariant formulation*, Phys. Lett. **B115** (1982) 111.

[3] J. H. Schwarz and P. C. West, *Symmetries and transformations of chiral $N = 2$, $D = 10$ supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B126** (1983) 301.

[4] P. S. Howe and P. C. West, *The complete $N = 2$, $D = 10$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B238** (1984) 181.

[5] J. H. Schwarz, *Covariant field equations of chiral $N = 2$ $D = 10$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 269.

[6] G. Dall'Agata, K. Lechner and M. Tonin, JHEP **9807** (1998) 017, [`arXiv:hep-th/9806140`].

[7] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and E. Witten, *Gravitational anomalies* Nucl. Phys. **B234** (1984) 269.

[8] P. S. Aspinwall, *Some relationships between dualities in string theory*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **46** (1996) 30, [`arXiv:hep-th/9508154`].

[9] J. H. Schwarz, *The power of M theory*, Phys. Lett. **B367** (1996) 97, [`arXiv:hep-th/9510086`].

[10] Michael B. Green, *Interconnections between type II superstrings, M theory and* $N = 4$ *supersymmetric Yang–Mills*, [`arXiv:hep-th/9903124`].

[11] M. Henningson, B. E. W. Nilsson and P. Salomonson, *Holomorphic factorization of correlation functions in* $(4k+2)$*-dimensional* $(2k)$*-form gauge theory*, JHEP **9909** (1999) 008, [`arXiv:hep-th/9908107`].

[12] E. Witten, *Duality relations among topological effects in string theory*, JHEP **0005** (2000) 031, [`arXiv:hep-th/9912086`].

[13] E. Diaconescu, G. Moore and E. Witten, E_8 *gauge theory, and a derivation of* K*-Theory from M-Theory*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **6** (2003) 1031, [`arXiv:hep-th/0005090`].

[14] C. Vafa, *Evidence for F-theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B469** (1996) 403, [`arXiv:hep-th/9602022`].

[15] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, *Unity of superstring dualities*, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 109, [`arXiv:hep-th/9410167`].

[16] J. Evslin and U. Varadarajan, K*-theory and S-duality: starting over from square 3*, JHEP **0303** (2003) 026 [`arXiv:hep-th/0112084`].

[17] J. Maldacena, G. Moore and N. Seiberg, *D-brane instantons and* K*-theory charges*, JHEP **0111** (2001) 062, [`arXiv:hep-th/0108100`].

[18] J. Evslin, *IIB soliton spectra with all fluxes activated*, Nucl. Phys. **B657** (2003) 139, [`arXiv:hep-th/0211172`].

[19] J. Evslin, *Twisted* K*-theory from monodromies*, JHEP **0305** (2003) 030, [`arXiv:hep-th/0302081`].

[20] E. Witten, *D-Branes and* K*-Theory*, JHEP **12** (1998) 019, [`arXiv:hep-th/9810188`].

[21] A. Kapustin, *D-branes in a topologically nontrivial B-field*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **4** (2000) 127, [`arXiv:hep-th/9909089`].

[22] P. Bouwknegt and V. Mathai, *D-branes, B-fields and twisted* K*-theory*, JHEP **03** (2000) 007, [`arXiv:hep-th/0002023`].

[23] V. Mathai and H. Sati, *Some relations between twisted* K*-theory and* E_8 *gauge theory*, JHEP **03** (2004) 016, [`arXiv:hep-th/0312033`].

[24] I. Kriz and H. Sati, *M Theory, type IIA superstrings, and elliptic cohomology*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **8** (2004) 345, [`arXiv:hep-th/0404013`].

[25] E. Witten, *Five-brane effective action in M-theory*, J. Geom. Phys. **22** (1997) 103, [`arXiv:hep-th/9610234`].

[26] M.J. Hopkins, I.M. Singer, *Quadratic functions in geometry, topology, and M-theory*, [`arXiv:math.AT/0211216`].

[27] L. Dolan and C. R. Nappi, *The Ramond-Ramond selfdual five-form's partition function on* T^{10}, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A15** (2000) 1261, [`arXiv:hep-th/0005074`].

[28] G. Moore and E. Witten, *Self duality, Ramond-Ramond fields, and K-theory*, JHEP **05** (2000) 032, [`arXiv:hep-th/9912279`].

[29] G. Moore and N. Saulina, *T-duality, and the K-theoretic partition function of Type IIA superstring theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B670** (2003) 27, [`arXiv:hep-th/0206092`].

[30] P. Bouwknegt, J. Evslin and V.Mathai, *T-duality: Topology change from H-flux*, Commun. Math. Phys. **249** (2004) 383, [`arXiv:hep-th/0306062`].

[31] D. S. Freed, *The Verlinde algebra is twisted equivariant K-theory*, Turk. J. Math. **25** (2001) 159, [`arXiv:math.RT/0101038`].

[32] D. S. Freed, M. J. Hopkins and C. Teleman, *Twisted K-theory and loop group representations*, [`arXiv:math.AT/0312155`].

[33] C. Teleman, *K-theory of the moduli space of bundles on a surface and deformations of the Verlinde algebra*, in Topology, Geometry and Quantum Field Theory, U. Tillmann (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 2004, [`arXiv:math.AG/0306347`].

[34] D. Quillen, *On the (co)homology of commutative rings*, in Applications of Categorial Algebra, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. **XVII**, AMS (1970).

[35] A. Connes, *Noncommutative geometry*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1994.

[36] M. Atiyah and G. Segal, *Twisted K-theory*, [`arXiv:math-KT/0407054`].

[37] D. S. Freed and E. Witten, *Anomalies in string theory with D-Branes*, Asian J. Math. **3** (1999) 819, [`arXiv:hep-th/9907189`].

[38] E. Diaconescu, D. Freed and G. Moore, *The M-theory 3-form and E8 gauge theory*, [`arXiv:hep-th/0312069`].

[39] I. Masden, V. Snaith and J. Tornehave, *Infinite loop maps in geometric topology*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **81** (1977) 399.

[40] B. Zhang, *K-twisted equivariant K-theory for* $SU(N)$, [`arXiv:math-KT/0311298`].

[41] C. L. Douglas, *On the twisted K-homology of simple Lie groups*, [`arXiv:math.AT/0402082`].

[42] P. Bouwknegt, A. L. Carey, V. Mathai, M. K. Murray and D. Stevenson, *Twisted K-theory and K-theory of bundle gerbes*, Commun. Math. Phys. **228** (2002) 17, [`arXiv:hep-th/0106194`].

[43] P. Hu and I. Kriz, *Closed and open conformal field theories and their anomalies*, to appear in Commun. Math. Phys., [`arXiv:hep-th/0401061`].

[44] N. Baas, B. A. Dundas and J. Rognes, *Two-vector bundles and forms of elliptic cohomology*, in Topology, Geometry and Quantum Field Theory, U. Tillmann (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 2004, [`arXiv:math.AT/0306027`].

[45] P. Hu and I. Kriz, *Conformal field theory and elliptic cohomology*, to appear in Advances in Mathematics.

[46] I. Kriz and H. Sati, work in progress.

[47] K. Dasgupta and S. Mukhi, *A note on low-dimensional string compactifications*, Phys. Lett. **B398** (1997) 285, [`arXiv:hep-th/9612188`].

[48] S. Stolz and P. Teichner, *What is an elliptic object?*, in Topology, Geometry and Quantum Field Theory, U. Tillmann (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[49] S. MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[50] F. Adams, *Stable homotopy and generalised homology*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.-London, 1974